DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 085 HE 013 548

AUTHOR Viehland, Dennis; And Others
TITLE Indexing Tuition and Fees to Cost of Education: Implications for State Policy.
INSTITUTION Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Higher Education of WICHE (6th, Tucson, AZ, December 3-5, 1980).
AVAILABLE FROM Information Clearinghouse, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, CO 80302.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Budgeting; College Students; *Cost Indexes; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Enrollment Influences; Equal Education; Fees; *Financial Policy; Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; Instructional Student Costs; Noninstructional Student Costs; Program Costs; *State Action; State Colleges; *Student Costs; *Tuition

ABSTRACT

Considerations for establishing a system for indexing tuition and fees to the cost of education and implications for state policy are examined. It is suggested that the attraction of the indexing approach to tuition arises from a number of causes including the upward pressure on tuition created by changing demographic and fiscal conditions. Results of a survey of current state policies for determining tuition indicated that 30 of the states do not have an established policy for determining tuition, three of the states have established policies but use no particular formula to determine tuition, and 17 states have established policies that index tuition to a specific measure. Indexing insures that a fixed portion of cost increases will be covered from student sources. The cost of education is determined according to set accounting practices, and the student is charged a set percentage of this cost. Elements that should be included in the computation of the cost of education or instruction and the need for cost studies are briefly considered. Differentiating the actual percentages to be charged by level, student residency status, and type of institution is considered. Implications of using an indexing system on state policy issues are considered in relation to: state budgeting, institutional autonomy, cost containment, impact on enrollment, cost study requirements, cost behavior, equity, and access. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200085

WICHE
Improving Education In The West

Indexing Tuition and Fees to Cost of Education: Implications for State Policy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WICHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Dennis Viehland
Barbara Krauth
Norman Kaufman

AE013 548

A paper presented at the Sixth Annual Conference on Higher Education held December 3-5, 1980 in Tucson, Arizona.

Indexing Tuition to Cost of Education: Implications for State Policy

For a variety of reasons, state policies used to set tuition* levels at public higher education institutions are changing. The traditional "incremental pricing" method of determining tuition and fees is being reconsidered in favor of specific pricing formulas, especially an index to the cost of education. The attraction of this approach arises from a number of causes including the upward pressure on tuition created by changing demographic and fiscal conditions.

Impact of Declining Enrollments and Fiscal Constraints on Tuition

The demographic outlook for higher education is irrefutable. The size of the traditional college-age cohort is growing smaller. Nationally, the number of high school graduates is expected to decline by 18 percent by 1986 and 26 percent by 1991 (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education 1979). Although a number of factors influence college enrollments, most projections forecast declining enrollments for higher education. The relationship of enrollment to tuition income is a positive one, and it is apparent that in order to maintain current levels of tuition income in a period of declining enrollments, student charges will have to increase. Further, at the same time enrollments decline, institutional costs will not. Costs for higher education institutions will rise not only due to inflation, increased maintenance, or higher energy prices, but also from the diseconomy of scale--a decreasing student population with rising fixed costs will result in increasing costs per student. Consequently, declining enrollments and increasing costs threaten a one-two punch on student charges--fewer students paying heftier fees.

Changing fiscal conditions within the states and the U.S. as a whole will also tend to increase tuition levels. The vulnerability of tuition to pressures of the economy is illustrated by three factors. First, public higher education is highly dependent upon state appropriations. In fiscal year 1977, tuition and fees accounted for only 16 percent of the educational and general revenues of public colleges and

*For the purpose of this paper tuition will be considered to be the basic comprehensive student charge used, along with state appropriations and other unrestricted institutional receipts, to fund activities relating to student instruction. These activities could include instruction, academic support, administration, student service, and plant operation. These charges may or may not be known as tuition and, in some states, may be general fund revenues. Other designations might include educational fee, incidental fee, registration fee or instructional fee. Required fees assessed for specific purposes (e.g., health, athletics, bond retirement) are not included.

universities; 59 percent of these revenues came from state and local appropriations. Second, higher education appropriations are a major component of total state appropriations, second only to elementary and secondary education in most states. Thus, cutbacks in state appropriations, even if distributed evenly among all state recipients, will have a sizable impact on higher education. Finally, tuition is usually viewed as the balance between operating budget requirements and state or local appropriations. As a result, when state or local government revenues are restricted, states will seek increased revenues from other sources, including tuition and fees for higher education.

Although both changing demographics and fiscal constraints point toward higher tuition, the latter is more ominous. The fact that higher education must now face a shrinking college-age cohort has been long anticipated and well-documented. Dismal fiscal conditions, in contrast, are more recent and more unexpected. Furthermore, it is the fiscal constraints that will be the more decisive in pushing up tuition. A research study by Rusk and Leslie (Rusk and Leslie 1978) describes this tendency. In a study of factors affecting tuition they found:

> Tuition prices and price increases tend clearly to be higher where the state effort is insufficient to the financial obligations of the institutions. Indeed, of the manipulable variables studied, adjusting state appropriations seems to be the major way to affect tuition levels. State policymakers should be aware of this fact not only for the value of achieving desired outcomes, but also for the knowledge that appropriations shortfalls will raise tuition prices just as surely as if the prices had been raised by the legislators themselves (p. 544).

This pattern has become evident in the current recessionary period when temporary revenue shortfalls in several states have resulted in mid-year tuition increases to recover lost revenues.

In addition, recent surveys of American public opinion have revealed surprisingly strong sentiments to curtail public higher education budgets before other public services. (See table 1, which shows the results of the survey by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.)

Table 1

Supposing the Budgets of Your State and Local Governments Have to be Curtailed, Which One of These Parts of the Budget Would You Limit Most Severely?

	U.S.	Northeast	North-Central	South	West
Public Safety (fire, police, criminal justice)	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%
Public Schools (kindergarten - 12th grade)	3	4	2	3	2
Tax-Supported Colleges and Universities	23	24	21	19	32
Aid to the Needy	8	3	9	11	6
Streets and Highways	11	15	10	7	16
Parks and Recreation	40	36	44	45	31
Don't Know	12	17	11	12	9
Total*	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%

*Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Source: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Opposed to these forces, however, are others that work to keep tuition levels as low as possible. Included among these are historical commitments to low student charges, the political sensitivity of elected officials, and a recognition of the social benefits of higher education. In the absence of an explicit affirmation of these considerations, however, tuition setting is likely to be viewed purely as a fiscal matter--and thus clearly vulnerable to the demographic and fiscal pressures just discussed.

Current State Policies for Determining Tuition

In October 1980 the authors surveyed the state higher education executive officers (SHEEO) in each state to ascertain the policy (if any) currently being used to determine tuition levels. Table 2 presents a summary of the survey results.

*The appendix includes more information about the survey, including a tabulation of state responses.

Table 2

State Policies for Determining Tuition Levels

No established policy: 30 states		
Established policy without specific formula: 3 states		
Established policy with specific formula:		
Indexed to:	Higher education price index:	1 state
	Cost of instruction:	1 state (nonresident tuition only)*
	Cost of education	14 states (nonresident tuition only in 2 states)*
	Charges at comparable institutions:	1 state

*In Montana nonresident tuition is set with reference to the cost of instruction. In Massachusetts and New Hampshire nonresident tuition is indexed to the cost of education. There is no established policy for determining resident tuition in these states.

Thirty of the states do not have an established policy for determining tuition. In most of these states tuition is determined in an ad hoc manner that might best be described as incremental pricing. By incremental pricing, we mean that current tuition levels are adjusted upward in light of inflation, traditional practices, enrollment changes, state appropriations, and whatever other factors are deemed relevant by the decision makers.

Three of the states have established policies, but use no particular formula to determine tuition. In these states, there is a written and formally approved statement of the factors to be considered in determining tuition levels, but no specific formula is used.

Seventeen states have established policies that index tuition to a specific measure. Kentucky indexes tuition to charges at comparable institutions in other states and Illinois uses the Higher Education Price Index as the indexing tool. In Montana nonresident tuition is referenced to cost of instruction. (Cost of instruction is defined as instruction and academic support costs; it is distinguished from cost of education, which includes these costs plus institutional support, student services, plant and other "educational" costs.)

The fourteen states that index tuition to the cost of education represent an increase since 1976, when the Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education identified six states that used this method (Council for Postsecondary Education January 1976). The six states identified in that study were Colorado, Florida, Kansas, New Hampshire (nonresident tuition only), Oregon, and Wisconsin. To these are now added the states of Arizona, Maine, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Washington. In addition, the state of Massachusetts determines nonresident tuition by indexing it to educational costs although the state has no established policy for setting resident student charges.

Indexing insures that a fixed portion of cost increases will be covered from student sources. This appeals to a number of constituencies: Legislators may like the fact that a formula for setting tuition passes along a specified portion of annual cost increases to the student. The attraction for educators is that increases in tuition revenue are gradual and planned rather than sudden and in response to short-term revenue shortfalls. In times of increasing fiscal constraints on state government, indexing also may be viewed as a method of "shielding" tuition from increases as state support slows. In inflationary times, indexing may appeal to students and parents as well. As Carol Van Alstyne (Van Alstyne 1977) has pointed out:

> Relating tuition to costs could in effect put a ceiling on the share that students and their families are expected to bear because, in inflationary times, tuition shares of costs have often increased more than proportionately as other sources of support have lagged (p. 76).

Considerations in Establishing Indexing Formulas

Indexing tuition to the cost of education is a straightforward, technically objective process: The cost of education is determined according to set accounting practices, and the student is charged a set percentage of this cost. Developing the policy, however, requires making a number of subjective decisions. The following discussion examines some of the questions that must be addressed in order to initiate an indexing system.

What elements should be included in the computation of the cost of education or instruction? Cost of instruction computations usually include on-campus instruction, plus a percentage of academic support costs. Cost of education is a broader term that also includes all or major portions of student service expenditures, institutional support, and plant maintenance expenses. Expenditures for capital improvements, research, public service, off-campus instruction and auxiliary enterprises are usually excluded from both definitions. Most states that use the indexing method relate tuition to the cost of education with the justification that the additional costs do support instruction and, indeed, that the education being "purchased" includes these costs.

Should costs be determined at all institutions? In other words, are cost studies necessary at all institutions? The answer to this question is probably not. Above all cost determinations should be parsimonious. Smaller colleges usually lack the technical resources and expertise necessary to carry out the studies. As a result, a fairly common practice is to require major universities to complete the cost studies and tuition at smaller institutions is then scaled to some percentage of the resulting university tuition. Some states may want to avoid cost studies altogether and use some measure, such as authorized budget figures, which is less accurate but also much less expensive to calculate.

The survey also asked the SHEEOs if their state was considering a change in the current policy and if so what was being considered as an alternative policy. These results are shown in table 3. Most states are not now considering a change in their tuition setting process. Of the 12 states that are considering a change, indexing tuition to educational costs was listed by five states as the alternative policy under consideration.

Table 3

Is your state considering a change in the policy or procedures used to determine tuition:

Yes: 12 states No: 38 states

What is being considered as an alternative policy or procedure?

Indexed to cost of education:	5 (Georgia, Massachusetts (resident tuition), Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri)
Indexed to charges at comparable institutions:	1 (Montana)
Many alternatives are being considered at this time:	6 (Colorado, Idaho, Kentucky, Texas, West Virginia, Hawaii)

Appeal of the Index to Cost of Education Method

The survey results outlined in the previous section indicated that, increasingly, states are adopting indexing to cost of education as an established policy for determining tuition. Several explanations for this trend are possible.

Most obvious is the fact that relating tuition to educational costs rationalizes tuition policy. In states that do not have established policies for determining tuition there is little justification for why student charges are what they are. A state's adoption of an indexing policy and, even more importantly, the specification of the percentages to be used provides an explicit declaration of what portion of educational costs the student is expected to assume.

Expressing tuition as a share of educational costs also creates a tighter link between tuition and overall state support. The policy is likely to be legislatively determined, and the tuition received is likely to be considered state income rather than institutional income. The concepts involved in the use of a formula to determine tuition are consistent with those used in formula budgeting to establish state appropriations in many states. Indeed, most states that index tuition to education costs also use formula budgeting.

A related question is, should the cost of education be computed by student level? Because of the difficulty of allocating costs by level most states seem to have decided not to compute the cost differences by levels.

What percentage of costs should be passed on to students in the form of tuition? In 1973 the Carnegie Commission for Higher Education recommended that tuition be increased to equal one-third of educational costs (Carnegie Commission for Higher Education 1973, p. 10). In that same year, the Committee for Economic Development (Committee for Economic Development 1973, p. 69) recommended that one-half of educational costs be passed on to students. For the most part, it appears that these recommendations have had little national effect. There is no evidence that any state charges more than one-third of educational costs to its resident students. A recent study by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE 1980) revealed that "tuition in the four western states with established indexing policies ranges from 20 to 25 percent of costs for resident undergraduates" (p. 10). The Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education (Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education May 1976), when establishing the indexing policy currently used in that state, wrote that, "in no case have we found a definitive, uniformly accepted philosophic basis indicating the proportion of total costs which should be borne by the student or the taxpayer" (p. 40). Even where attempts are made to base charges on such principles, technical problems complicate the effort, as MacDonald points out:

> The rationale for tuition charges at a public institution is often based on the argument that individuals should pay for the portion of the benefits that accrue to each personally, while the public should pay for that portion which contributes to the social benefit of all. However, the art of defining, measuring, and allocating these benefits is not very advanced; given the complex nature of the products of educational endeavor, it is unlikely to ever be very precise (MacDonald 1977, p. 3).

Additionally, all involved in the process should recognize that although the use of an index relating tuition to a percentage of costs produces a uniform, and presumably reasonable, standard for annual or biennial tuition increases, those increases are likely to be reviewed and challenged by affected parties each year. States (Florida and Washington, for example) have sometimes lowered the dollar amount of tuition increases even when they were generated by use of an educational cost index. In Washington, the formula specifies that students be charged 25 percent of educational costs, but in the last legislative session tuition was established at a dollar figure that amounted to 18 percent of calculated costs.

Should the percentages charged vary by student level? Although conducting costs studies to yield data by student level is a technical problem, differentiating the actual percentages to be charged by level is a philosophical one. In Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?, the Carnegie Commission (Carnegie Commission 1973) recommended that "tuition should be more nearly proportional to costs, rather than regressive as against students at the lower levels" (p. 12). The Commission thus urged that graduate students be charged the same percentage of costs as undergraduates. But because graduate instructional costs are

greater, they recommended that the amount of tuition graduate students pay should be higher. This seems to be a position most policy makers embrace, but one which, as noted before, is difficult to implement because of the difficulty in separating undergraduate educational costs from graduate costs. Instead, some states have simply adopted a policy of determining undergraduate tuition and then charging graduate students at a specified, higher rate. Colorado, for example, sets graduate tuition at 105 percent of undergraduate charges, and in Washington graduate students are charged 115 percent of undergraduate tuition. The intent of the Carnegie Commission's recommendation is followed in such cases even if the recommended process is not.

The practice of charging different percentages of costs to upper and lower division undergraduates is uncommon. The pressure to reduce the percentage charged to lower division students could increase, however, as institutions adopt policies to encourage adult participation and to increase the access of economically disadvantaged groups because these groups are especially responsive to educational charges. Available evidence suggests that costs per student, by level, do not differ significantly across institutional types (Johnson 1979). Therefore, a uniform percentage of costs applied to different levels of undergraduate instruction would result in lower tuition for lower division students at both four-year and community colleges.

Should the percentage charged vary by student residency? Based on current practice, the answer to this question is clearly yes. In almost all states, whether indexing is used or not, nonresident students have traditionally been charged approximately 100 percent of the cost of education. Although this practice seems well entrenched, a period of increased competition for students might bring about some changes in this policy. Institutions, especially those experiencing enrollment losses, may be inclined to lower this percentage in order to attract additional out-of-state students. Clearly there is conflict between the desire to charge nonresidents the full cost of education and the desire to maintain current enrollment levels and diversity in the student body.

Should the percentage charged vary by type of institution? Although per student costs by level of instruction do not differ significantly across institutional types (e.g., two-year, four-year, university), there is a difference in the educational product being purchased. Thus, equity may not be served by charging a uniform percentage across all institutional types. Additionally, as certain institutions lose enrollments, officials may try to distribute students to those institutions by lowering tuition. Although previous attempts to redistribute students through such adjustments have been notoriously unsuccessful, political pressures might well lead some states to try this approach again in the future.

Implications

Adoption of an indexing system for setting tuition implies that certain principles will be better served through such a policy. Clearly, state policy goals should be the starting point for determining the proportions to be used in an indexing approach. Student access, support for graduate education, and diversity of student bodies are all affected by tuition levels, and indexing tuition to educational costs can be one way in which state financial policy is made explicit. The percentages chosen should reflect consideration of fundamental policy issues, such as the relative benefits of higher education to both society and the individual as well as the relative costs, including foregone personal income. Current practice, however, rarely matches the ideal. In most states, the percentage of costs chosen is more likely to be a product of historical patterns, interstate comparisons, or current charges rather than of clear policy decisions.

Adoption of a policy that sets tuition by use of an index involves implications for a number of different constituencies with respect to planning, budgeting and student enrollment:

State Budgeting. As total enrollments stabilize while costs continue to increase, will state appropriations make up the difference between tuition income and the requested budget? Or, will there be continued pressures to increase overall revenues from tuition? As we noted, the use of a constant percentage index to set tuition will assure that annual increases in tuition will not be arbitrary. However, the same pressures that would drive up tuition charges in the absence of a formula, could also work to change the formula to yield more revenue. An indexing arrangement could be undone by price increases that are unacceptable to students and politicans. We have already seen several states adopt tuition increases lower than those generated by indexing formulas.

Institutional Autonomy. It appears that using an index reinforces the notion that tuition revenues are state funds--either general revenues or offsets to appropriations. The practical effect of this view is a reduction in institutional autonomy. Indexing tends to curtail institutional control over the amount of money generated from tuition and also to decrease budgetary flexibility in the use of these revenues at the campus level.

Cost Containment. Will higher education institutions be able to contain their real dollar expenditures in light of declining enrollments in order to stablize their per student costs? Elementary and secondary schools have been unable to do this; higher education, with its high fixed costs, will probably not be able to either. Higher per student costs in an indexing arrangement will obviously result in increasing student charges. If students are sufficiently sensitive to price, these higher charges may put pressure on administrators to contain costs. Cost containment, however, will require programmatic and staffing cutbacks as well and these have not been easy to achieve in the past.

Impact on Enrollment. It is possible that if tuition is indexed to costs that are rapidly increasing, the resulting tuition increases may contribute to enrollment declines.

Cost Study Requirements. If states require extensive documentation, administrators will be burdened with the need to conduct annual studies to determine per student instructional or educational costs. As part of this process, they may be called upon to justify or explain differences among institutions. This would serve to politicize the process rather than to rationalize it.

Cost Behavior. Regardless of the procedures used, budget officials should be cognizant of the fact that the behavior of costs usually results in what we earlier called incremental pricing even in states that set tuition as a percentage of educational costs. Because costs are essentially a function of the dollars available to an institution in any given year, and because annual changes in educational costs tend to result from marginal additions, tuition changes generated by formula-driven computations turn out in the end to be incremental too.

Equity. If costing is to be used as a basis for setting tuition rates, how is equity for students at different institutions to be achieved? To set tuition at 25 percent of costs at one class of institutions and 20 percent of costs at another class for the purpose of creating price differences is to treat one group of students unequally based on their enrollment preferences. Policy makers should address these questions openly in enacting such policies.

Access. These considerations also bear heavily on issues relating to access for the economically disadvantaged, adult students, and those traditional students whose attendance patterns are influenced more by price than by curricula or selectivity. Unless financial aid is adjusted accordingly, these students may be deterred from enrolling at higher-priced campuses, which might impede efforts by those schools to increase their enrollment of minorities, adults and other affected classes.

To summarize, the use of a tuition index should be tied to a firm educational and social policy. The simplicity of using a tuition formula is illusory, because it encompasses a wide range of issues and principles. State policy makers need to move beyond the view of tuition setting as only a fiscal matter to address some of these issues. If a tuition index results from a careful discussion of its broad implications for finance and access, then it can become a highly appropriate vehicle for implementing state policy.

Bibliography

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Changing Public Attitudes on Governments and Taxes. Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1980.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Committee for Economic Development. The Management and Financing of Colleges. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1973.

Council for Postsecondary Education, State of Washington. Cost of Instruction Study. A Staff Report in Response to Senate Resolution 1975-131. Olympia, Washington: Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education, January, 1976.

_____. Policy Recommendations: A System of Establishing Tuition and Fees as a Proportion of Educational Costs. Olympia, Washington: Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education, May 1976.

Johnson, Jane L. "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Instructional Costs and Differential Tuition Levels." Journal of Higher Education 50 (May/June 1979): 280-288.

MacDonald, Douglas S. Alternative Tuition Systems. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977.

Rusk, James J. and Leslie, Larry L. "The Setting of Tuition in Public Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education 49 (November/December 1978): 531-547.

Van Alstyne, Carol. "Rationales for Setting Tuition Levels at Public Institutions." Educational Record 58 (Winter 1977): 66-82.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. High School Graduates: Projections for the Fifty States. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1979.

_____. Tuition and Fees in Public Higher Education in the West. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1980.

APPENDIX

State Policies for Determining Tuition

State	Established Policy for Determining Tuition Levels?	If Yes, It is	Considering a Change?	If Yes, to What?
Alabama	No	--	No	--
Alaska	No	--	No	--
Arizona	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Arkansas	No	--	No	--
California	No	--	No	--
Colorado	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time, especially a voucher system.
Connecticut	No	--	No	--
Delaware	No	--	No	--
Florida	Yes	Indexed to cost of education [1]	No	--
Georgia	No	--	Yes	Indexed to cost of education or instruction.
Hawaii	No	--	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time, especially indexed to cost of instruction.
Idaho	No	--	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time.
Illinois	Yes	Indexed to higher education price index	No	--
Indiana	No	--	No	--
Iowa	Yes	Specified considerations [2]	No	--
Kansas	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Kentucky	Yes	Indexed to charges at comparable institutions	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time.
Louisiana	No	--	No	--
Maine	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--

State	Established Policy for Determining Tuition Levels?	If Yes, It Is	Considering a Change?	If Yes, to What?
Maryland	No	--	No	--
Massachusetts				
Resident	No	--	Yes	Indexed to cost of education.
Nonresident	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Michigan	No	--	No	--
Minnesota	No	--	Yes	Indexed to cost of education.
Mississippi	No	--	Yes	Indexed to cost of education.
Missouri	No	--	Yes	Indexed to cost of education.[3]
Montana				
Resident	No	--	Yes	Indexed to charges at comparable institutions.
Nonresident	Yes	Referenced to cost of instruction		
Nebraska	No	--	No	--
Nevada	No	--	No	--
New Hampshire				
Resident	No	--	No	--
Nonresident	Yes	Indexed to cost of education		
New Jersey	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
New Mexico	No	--	No	--
New York	No	--	No	--
North Carolina	No	--	No	--
North Dakota	No	--	No	--
Ohio	Yes	Indexed to cost of education[4]	No	--
Oklahoma	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Oregon	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Pennsylvania	No	--	No	--
Rhode Island	Yes	Specified considerations[2]	No	--
South Carolina	No	--	No	--

16

State	Established Policy for Determining Tuition Levels?	If Yes, It Is	Considering a Change?	If Yes, to What?
South Dakota	No	--	No	--
Tennessee	No	--	No	--
Texas	No	--	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time.
Utah	Yes	Specified considerations[2]	No	--
Vermont	No	--	No	--
Virginia	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Washington	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
West Virginia	No	--	Yes	Many alternatives are being considered at this time.
Wisconsin	Yes	Indexed to cost of education	No	--
Wyoming	No	--	No	--

[1]This policy was established in 1975 but has not always been followed. Tuition and fee levels in Florida have remained the same for the past few years.

[2]No specific formula is used. Rather there is a written and formally approved policy statement which specifies considerations to be made in adjustment of tuition.

[3]In Missouri the tuition levels are established by the governing boards. The coordinating board, through the appropriation process, is encouranging tuition be indexed to cost of education.

[4]In Ohio the tuition levels are established by the governing boards. In the appropriations process, however, a tuition figure indexed to educational costs is calculated and is generally adopted by the institutions.

Questionnaire

STATE POLICIES FOR DETERMINING TUITION

The tuition policy described below should be applicable to all public four-year institutions in your state. If, however, there are significant policy differences within the state (e.g., a university system and a state college system), please complete additional forms as required.

Please use the following definitions when completing this form:

TUITION: the basic comprehensive student charge used, along with state appropriations and other unrestricted institutional receipts, to fund activities relating to student instruction. These activities could include instruction, academic support, administration, student services, and plant operation. These charges may or may not be known as tuition and, in some states, may be general fund revenues. Other designations might include educational fee, incidental fee, registration fee, or instructional fee. Required fees assessed for specific purposes (e.g., health, athletics, bond retirement) are not included.

ESTABLISHED POLICY: either formally approved or a traditional practice such that the effect is the same.

If you have any questions, please contact Dennis Viehland or Norman Kaufman at (303) 497-0223 or 0221.

State _____ Institutions included: ___ All public four-year institutions

___ Other _____

1. Does your state have an established policy for determining tuition levels?

___ Yes: ___ Formally approved ___ Traditional practice (Please answer 2a)

___ No (Please answer 2b)

2a. If YES, is it:

___ Indexed to:

___ Consumer price index

___ Higher education price index

___ Cost of instruction (instructional and academic support costs)

___ Cost of education (instructional costs plus administration, student services, plant and other "educational" costs)

___ Charges at comparable institutions

___ Other method, please describe:

_____

_____

_____

_____

2b. If NO, can your state's procedures be described as "ad hoc," that is, no specific formula is used as described in 2a. Rather, charges are adjusted each year after considering a number of factors such as state appropriations, enrollment changes, etc.

___ Yes ___ No, please describe briefly: _____

_____

3a. Is your state considering a change in the policy or procedures currently used to determine tuition?

___ Yes ___ No

3b. If YES, what is being considered as an alternative policy or procedure:

___ Indexed to:

___ Consumer price index

___ Higher education price index

___ Cost of instruction

___ Cost of education

___ Charges at comparable institutions

___ Other method, please describe:

_____

_____

_____

___ Many alternatives are being considered at this time.

Person completing this questionnaire and order form for Tuition and Fees in Public Higher Education in the West: Practices, Trends, Policy Considerations.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Agency: _____ Phone: _____

Address: _____

(Street/P.O. Box, City, State, Zip Code)

THANK YOU!